DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 094 SP 026 958

AUTHOR	Huling-Austin, Leslie; And Others
TITLE	Strategies for Improving Teacher Education. MTIP Satellite Network Conference Proceedings (Austin, Texas, November 1-2, 1984; Austin, Texas, April 22-23, 1985).
INSTITUTION	Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Aug 85
NOTE	68p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teachers; Inservice Teacher Education; Mentors; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS	*Beginning Teacher Induction; *Model Teacher Induction Program

ABSTRACT

This document reports the proceedings of two conferences pertaining to the Model Teacher Induction Program (MTIP), developed by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (Austin, Texas). The two conferences were for network participants of the MTIP Satellite Network. The proceedings of the conferences, including conference overviews, agendas, major addresses, synopses of participant reports, and comments from conference evaluation are offered. The major address given at the November 1984 conference, "Induction: The State of the Art" (Sara A. Edwards), is included, as is a synopsis of the major address given at the April 1985 conference, "Mentoring: A Review of the Literature with a Focus on Teaching" (Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik). The network's collaborative study on teacher induction in diverse contexts is also reported. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MTIP SATELLITE NETWORK CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Leslie Huling-Austin
Scottie Putman
Sara Edwards
and
Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik

R&D Report No. 7209

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT
REPRODUCIBLE ON MICROFILM

To order additional copies of this report or a catalog of publications, contact Communication Services, Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Education Annex 3.203, Austin, Texas 78712.

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

MTIP SATELLITE NETWORK CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Leslie Huling-Austin
Scottie Putman
Sara Edwards
and
Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik

R&D Report No. 7209

Leslie Huling-Austin, Program Director
Strategies for Improving Teacher Education

August, 1985

MTIP Satellite Network: Conference Proceedings

Leslie Huling-Austin, Scottie Putman, Sara Edwards

and Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Abstract

In November 1984, and April 1985, two national conferences devoted to the topic of teacher induction were hosted in Austin, Texas by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas at Austin. These conferences were a part of the Center's ongoing research in teacher induction, the most recent effort of which was the Model Teacher Induction Project (MTIP). In conjunction with the MTIP, the Center in 1984 organized and has since coordinated a national teacher induction network known as the MTIP Satellite Network. The two conferences noted above were sponsored for the network participants as a part of the network effort.

This document reports the proceedings of those two conferences, including conference overviews, agendas, major addresses, synopses of participant reports, and representative comments from the conference evaluations. An overview is also included of the MTIP Network Collaborative Study on Teacher Induction in Diverse Contexts, which was an outcome of the April conference.

Following a brief discussion of the MTIP and the MTIP Satellite Network, this report is divided into three main sections reporting on a) the November conference, b) the April conference, and c) the network collaborative study on teacher induction indiverse contexts. Participant lists are included in the appendices.

Table of Contents

The MTIP and the MTIP Satellite Network 1

The Model Teacher Induction Project. 2

The MTIP Satellite Network 4

MTIP Satellite Network Conference, November, 1984 9

Conference Overview. 9

"Induction: The State of the Art" by Sara A. Edwards 13

Synopses of Participant Reports. 23

Conference Evaluation. 27

MTIP Satellite Network Conference, April, 1985. 29

Conference Overview. 29

A Synopsis of "Mentoring: A Review of the Literature with a Focus on Teaching" by Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik 33

Synopses of Participant Reports. 51

Conference Evaluation. 55

Network Collaborative Study on Teacher Induction in Diverse Contexts 57

Appendices. 63

Appendix A: Participants, November Conference 65

Appendix B: Participants, April Conference. 67

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 1: MTIP Satellite Conference Agenda
November 1-2, 1984. 8

Exhibit 2: MTIP Satellite Conference Agenda
April 22-23, 1984 26

Exhibit 3: Participants in the Collaborative Study
of Induction in Diverse Contexts. 52

Exhibit 4: Research Questions for the Collaborative Study
of Induction in Diverse Contexts. 53

Exhibit 5: Data Collection for the Collaborative Study
of Induction in Diverse Contexts. 54

MTIP SATELLITE NETWORK CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

R&D CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

In November, 1984, and April, 1985, two national conferences devoted to the topic of teacher induction were hosted in Austin, Texas, by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas at Austin. These conferences were a part of the Center's ongoing research in teacher induction, the most recent effort of which was the Model Teacher Induction Project (MTIP). The MTIP was a research-based induction program developed by R&DCTE and field-tested during the 1984-85 school year. In conjunction with the MTIP, the Center in 1984 organized and has since coordinated a national teacher induction network known as the MTIP Satellite Network. The two conferences noted above were sponsored for the network participants as a part of the network effort. Currently, approximately 35 network members are engaged in a collaborative study of teacher induction in diverse contexts as a result of ideas generated at the two conferences. The purposes of this report are to:

1) provide background information on the MTIP and the MTIP Satellite Network,
2) provide proceedings from the two network conferences, and
3 share information related to the network collaborative study which resulted from work begun at the conferences.

The MTIP and the MTIP Satellite Network

In January, 1984, the three research programs of the R&DCTE set out to collaboratively develop and field-test a research-based induction program for beginning teachers. In addition to considering a large body of research

from the U.S. and other countries on the induction of beginning teachers, each of the three programs had relevant research of its own to contribute to the effort. The Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program was completing the Teacher Induction Study, a policy into practice study of two state mandated induction programs. The Research on Classroom Learning and Teaching (RCLT) program had conducted research on organizing and managing classrooms and on managing academic tasks, two areas which are typically difficult for the beginning teacher to master. The Research on the Improvement Process (RIP) program had a long history of conducting research on and developing strategies for diagnosing the needs and concerns of teachers and ways of providing effective staff development interventions to facilitate improvement. The induction program which resulted from the efforts of the three research programs was named the Model Teacher Induction Project (MTIP) and efforts began to arrange a site for the field test of the program during the 1984-85 school year. In conjunction with the MTIP, the Center undertook an effort to organize and coordinate a national network of institutions working in the area of teacher induction to serve in an advisory capacity to the MTIP and to begin to develop avenues for the future possible dissemination of the MTIP or its components.

The Model Teacher Induction Project

Arrangements were made for the MTIP to be field-tested in a suburban district near Austin with beginning middle school teachers assigned to teach academic subject areas (language arts, math, science or social studies). The participating sample consisted of six first-year middle school teachers, four support teachers, and two school principals. Because the purpose of the field test was to demonstrate and study beginning teacher support processes suggested by research, the project consisted of conducting a pilot

induction program and simultaneously conducting research on the program, the participants and their practice. The pilot project focused on specific issues facing first-year teachers such as: beginning the school year, classroom management, organizing instruction, and grading and evaluation of pupils. Program staff collaborated with school district personnel to identify and train support teachers at each campus and to provide ongoing technical assistance to both support and first-year teachers throughout the school year.

Prior to the beginning of school, R&DCTE staff conducted research-based workshops (1) for both support and first-year teachers on teaching effectiveness and classroom organization and management and (2) for support teachers on identifying and responding to needs and concerns of first-year teachers. Needs and interests of the participants were assessed periodically and used to guide the content of additional training and support activities which included support meetings, observations and follow-up conferences, a workshop on working with low achieving students and getting a fresh start after the Christmas break, and release time for first-year teachers to observe experienced teachers.

The research related to the MTIP involved the collection of a variety of data--demographic data on participating teachers, the schools and the district; concerns questionnaires administered to first-year teachers and facilitators at the beginning of the year, midyear and at the end of the year; interviews of first-year teachers, support teachers, and building administrators; classroom observations; documentation of interventions; and daily journal entries made by first-year teachers and support teachers the first week of each month of the school year. A number of products have been developed from the research conducted on the MTIP and these are available

from R&DCTE (Huling-Austin, Barnes, & Smith, 1985; Huling-Austin & Emmer, 1985; Smith & Huling-Austin, 1985).

The MTIP Satellite Network

Efforts to organize the MTIP Satellite Network began in the spring of 1984. Initial plans were to select 12-15 institutions that were active in the area of teacher induction to serve in an advisory capacity to the MTIP and to establish channels for the future dissemination of components of the MTIP. It was planned that these persons would convene in Austin once in the fall and once in the spring to work with the staff of the MTIP. Center staff were asked to provide the names of individuals and institutions that would be likely candidates to participate in the MTIP Satellite Network. These contacts were made and a "Call for Publications" was published in the AACTE Briefs. By the July 15, 1984, application deadline approximately 50 applications were received from a wide variety of institutions including colleges and universities, school districts, state departments of education, regional education service agencies and professional organizations. Because of the large number of strong applicants, plans were adjusted to include approximately 30 institutions in the network group. The selection committee made every effort to achieve a wide geographic representation of the United States and a balance of different types of settings and institutions with varying types of programs for beginning teachers. After the initial selection period, several other institutions were added to the group. The names of all persons who expressed an interest in the network were placed on a mailing list of the extended network and they receive quarterly induction newsletters produced by the Center and other periodic communications related to teacher induction. To date, the membership of the extended network has grown to approximately 200.

In addition to hosting two MTIP Satellite Network conferences, the Center has supported the network in various other ways. Four issues of MTIP Satellite Communications, a quarterly newsletter, were produced in the 1984-85 academic year and this publication will be continued. A number of induction related publications from the Center and other sources have been disseminated to network members, and the network has functioned as a linking resource to connect persons working in the field with others who have particular expertise or similar interests. The Center also takes the lead in arranging for professional conference presentations about network activities, most of which involve network members as co-presenters with MTIP staff.

The MTIP Satellite Network also has a formal arrangement with the ATE Committee on the Induction Process. All commission members have become members of the network, and the network and the commission are collaborating on the publication of a national directory of induction programs and a monograph to be produced in 1986.

Finally, the MTIP Satellite Network is conducting a national collaborative study of teacher induction in diverse contexts during the 1985-86 school year. This study will be described in more detail in the final section of this report.

References

Huling-Austin, L., Barnes, S., & Smith, J. (1985). A research-based staff development program for beginning teachers (Rep. No. 7201). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Huling-Austin, L., & Emmer, E. (1985). First days of school: A good beginning (Rep. No. 7206). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Smith, J. , & Huling-Austin, L. (1985). Professional Development: Experienced Teachers Assisting First Year Teachers (Rep. No. 7210). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

MTIP SATELLITE NETWORK CONFERENCE

NOVEMBER, 1984

Conference Overview

On November 1 and 2, 1984, participants in the first MTIP Satellite Conference met to share information about induction activities in their institutions, to learn about the Model Teacher Induction Program, and to explore future directions for collaborative research and development related to the induction of beginning teachers. There were a total of 45 conference participants representing 17 states and Washington, D.C., with 11 participants from the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. A list of conference participants is shown in Appendix A. The conference agenda is shown in Exhibit 1.

Leslie Huling-Austin, MTIP Satellite Coordinator, opened the conference by welcoming the participants and explaining the goals of the conference. These goals were:

1) for participants to learn about each others' induction activities and programs,

2) to obtain input from participants on the Model Teacher Induction Project, and

3) to begin developing a functional network of persons working in the area of teacher induction.

Sara Edwards from the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) Program at R&DCTE presented the opening address, "Induction: The State of the Art." The paper derived from these remarks is included in the following section. Frank Gonzales from the Strategies in Teacher Education (SITE) Program at R&DCTE presented an overview of the MTIP program.

The two days of the conference were structured around participant reports and small group work activities regarding induction. Brief

Exhibit 1

MTIP Satellite Conference Agenda
November 1-2, 1984
Joe C. Thompson Conference Center
The University of Texas at Austin

Thursday, November 1

8:00 - 8:30 a.m.	Coffee, Juice, Pastries
8:30 - 8:45	Welcome & Focusing the Work of the Conference --Leslie Huling-Austin, MTIP Satellite Coordinator
8:45 - 9:15	Induction: The State of the Art --Sara Edwards, Research in Teacher Education (RITE) Program
9:15 - 10:00	Participant Report #1 Peggy Stank, Pennsylvania Department of Ed. Participant Report #2 Michael Carl, Portland State University
10:00 - 10:15	Break
10:15 - 11:15	Small Group Activity #1 Perspectives of teacher induction
11:15 - 11:45	Debriefing/Group Reports
11:45 - 1:00 p.m.	Catered Lunch
1:00 - 1:45	Participant Report #3 Richard Arends, University of Maryland Participant Report #4 Mary Marockie, Regional Education Service Agency VI (Wheeling, WV)
1:45 - 2:15	MTIP: The Program --Frank Gonzales, Strategies for Improving Teacher Education SITE Program
2:15 - 2:30	Break
2:30 - 3:30	Small Group Activity #2 Discussion about the MTIP and its possible dissemination
3:30 - 4:00	Debriefing/Group Reports Dinner groups to be organized to go to various restaurants

Friday, November 2

8:00 - 8:30 a.m.	Coffee, Juice, Pastries
8:30 - 8:45	Opening Remarks -- Leslie Huling-Austin
8:45 - 9:30	Participant Report #5 Marilyn Rauth, American Federation of Teachers Participant Report #6 Connie Bridge, University of Kentucky
9:30 - 9:45	Break
9:45 - 10:30	MTIP: The Research --Susan Barnes, MTIP Coordinator
10:30 - 11:30	Small Group Activity #3 What are important research questions to be addressed related to induction? What are the possibilities for a collaborative research endeavor?
11:30 - 12:00	Debriefing/Group Reports
12:00 - 1:00 p.m.	Catered Lunch
1:00 - 1:30	Large Group Discussion The Satellite Network: How It Can Work and the Possibilities for the Future --Leslie Huling-Austin, MTIP Satellite Coordinator
1:30 - 2:00	Conference Wrap-Up and Nominations for Spring Conference Activities
2:00 p.m.	Adjourn

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

descriptions of the six programs presented are included in a later section (see page 20). Also a part of the two day's activities were three small group work sessions. The first revolved around perspectives of teacher induction; the second around discussion about the MTIP and its possible dissemination; and the third revolved around the important research questions to be addressed and the possibilities for collaborative research endeavors.

Each of the small group work sessions had a set of focusing questions to guide their discussions. The primary objective of Activity 1 was to help participants get better acquainted and to broaden awareness and understanding of difference types of induction programs. The focusing questions for this activity were:

1. Each person in the group should describe the induction activities in which his or her institution is involved.

2. Item #1 will probably take most of the hour. After all of the programs have been described, participants should discuss the following points:

    a. Highlight the diversity identified in the different types of programs including the settings, scope of the programs, numbers of persons involved, and primary objective of the program.

    b. What are some of the commonalities of the different programs?

    c. In what ways, if any, are the different types of programs complementary or compatible with each other? Are there examples of different programs which each address part of the total induction needs of beginning teachers?

The second small group activity focused on the possible application of the MTIP in other settings. Its focusing questions were:

1. To what degree does MTIP address your concerns, issues, needs?

2. How feasible would it be to transport all or part of MTIP to your situations? Which parts?

3. What is missing in the MTIP?

In the third small group activity, participants identified important research questions related to teacher induction and discussed the possibility for future collaborative research endeavors. The focusing questions were:

1. What are important research questions related to the topic of teacher induction?

2. What ways would you suggest addressing each of these questions (i.e., How would you set up a study? What types of data would you need to collect, etc.?)

3 It has been suggested that one activity that the MTIP Satellite could engage in next year is some type of collaborative research endeavor.

   a) To what degree is there interest in doing this?

   b) What are different possibilities for what this might entail?

Notes from each of the group activities were transcribed for later use. In addition, as part of the planning process in the R&D Center's bid for the NIE Center on Teacher Education, input was obtained from conference participants regarding their ideas about the role and function of an R & D Center and important topics in teacher education in need of investigation.

Induction: The State of the Art

Sara A. Edwards
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

All experienced teachers entered the field of education at some point as inexperienced teachers. Those who aspire to become "experienced teachers" must begin at the point of their inexperience. Between the points of inexperienced beginner and experienced professional is a little-understood period of transition. This transition from student of teaching to teacher is often referred to as "induction."

Obviously, new teachers have been getting made into old teachers for at least as long as schools have been around. Some new teachers didn't make it and some of those who did make it might have helped the world more if they hadn't made it, but, all in all, through various ways and means, enough teachers have been around to keep schools going. And, I suppose, some of what happened that turned "not a teacher" into "now a teacher" could be termed "induction."

The process early on was sort of like learning to quilt or carve wood; a body took a liking to it, watched and tried out things and got reactions from other people and practiced, and when someone was willing to pay for the quilting or the wood carving or the teaching, then voila!: that body became a quilt maker or a wood carver or a teacher.

Then things got organized and standardized and sanitized and mass produced and analyzed and evaluated and that brings us to Induction: The State of the Art.

Regarding a study of beginning teaching conducted by the Educational Testing Service for the National Institute of Education, McDonald (1980)

stated: "perhaps the most important conclusion of this study is that the problems of beginning teachers have not really been throughly studied" (p. 478), and "the most important outcome of this study might well be to call attention to the critical nature of the transition period into teaching" (p. 14). The McDonald study found that "We have little information about how teachers pass through the transition stage, other than to know that some apparently do so successfully, some do not. We have no detailed information on how those people who master the transition period do so. Nor do we have information on how different kinds of assistance or help directly or indirectly influence the teachers' successful mastery of the induction period" (p. 44).

McDonald and his colleagues are among many researchers and teacher educators who have considered the issues associated with the induction period of teaching (Ryan, 1970, 1974; Bolam, McMahon, Davis, & McCabbe, 1977; Tisher, 1978; Lortie, 1975). In short, all agree that the transition from preservice teaching to inservice teaching is in need of greater research attention.

In addition, the National Center for Education Statistics estimates that the demand for new teachers between 1986 and 1990 should reach 197,000 per year (Feistritzer, 1983). At the same time, the number of people entering college to prepare themselves for a career in education has steadily diminished (Feistritzer, 1983). A shortage of teachers is imminent.

In April 1983 the National Commission on Excellence in Education published its report on the quality of education in America (A Nation at Risk) focusing national attention in part on the concern regarding

qualifications of newly certificated teachers and announcing the imperative for educational reform.

Under constituent pressure, policy makers acted. In May of 1984 the United States Department of Education published a volume titled The Nation Responds in which is presented an overview of national developments in the previous 12 months and in which is included a chart summarizing recent state initiatives. Forty-eight states report initiatives in one or both of the areas of teacher preparation/certification and teacher shortages. It should be noted that Oklahoma is prominent among the states which have enacted legislation directly influencing programs of induction although that initiative is not reported in the chart as the legislation was passed in 1980.

Clearly, there is wide-spread response to the increasing shortage of teachers and to the national concern regarding the qualifications of newly certificated teachers. State policy-making bodies are mandating programs aimed at beginning teachers. Policies and programs are being translated into practice at district, school, and classroom levels of activity. Various programs are in place and a rapidly growing data base is emerging from them in regard to questions and answers surrounding the induction process.

Given that policy is impelling practice in the development and implementation of programs of induction and that there are data now available for study, an appropriate question might be "What research is available for use in induction programs?" Gary Griffin responded directly and clearly to that question in a presentation for a national conference on Policies, Practices, and Research in Teacher Education. The question could be answered quite simply, he said. There is "very little."

> What we in the United States have done is to use research findings from studies of other educational and teaching phenomena as bases for making decisions about induction programs. In addition to bodies of findings that are derived from inquiry into educational issues, we also turn to research, theory, and propositions from related social science fields such as sociology, psychology, and anthropology (Griffin, 1985, p. 176).

Many of the induction programs are drawing on research on effective teaching. In some cases a set of standards is derived from this research and new teachers are assessed and assisted in terms of those standards. Often these standards take the form of expected or desired behaviors and are regarded as competencies to be demonstrated. The resulting programs appear to be more oriented to induction perceived as science rather than art. The on-going debate as to whether teaching is an art or a science continues in this area. In many of the current induction efforts, the tendency is clearly toward taking a scientific point of view.

There are a number of induction programs now in place through which this transition process is guided by a systematically planned and implemented effort directed toward stated outcomes. Florida and Oklahoma are prominent among the states which have enacted legislation directly influencing programs of induction. The Florida requirement of new teacher participation in a year-long beginning teacher program became effective July 1, 1982. The Oklahoma legislation passed in 1980 required an entry year assistance program for all beginning teachers. These two programs have been implemented and a rapidly growing data base is emerging from them in regard to questions and issues surrounding the induction process. The intent of these programs is that novices become competent professionals as rapidly, efficiently, and cost-effectively as possible. The assumption is that the effects of these programs on the transition process will be positive toward that end. There are now data available to permit the study of the validity of that assumption.

The competency based induction program is clearly the presently prevailing movement but there are (as usual) counter-trends vying for consideration. One example is the Virginia Polytechnic Institute's College of Education model for an induction program with a developmental base (Wildman & Borko, 1983). In contrast to the competency models in which there is no consideration of internal psychological processes and stresses, this model suggests that learning proceeds in phases, that an induction program must be heavily assistance/nurturance oriented, and that while it may be desirable to have teachers model and practice particular behaviors, that is only to ensure confidence and an expanded repertoire of teaching skills. The main focus should be in areas considered to be critical to the conception of teaching as a profession such as decision-making or teacher deliberation skills and the acquisition of an expanded repertoire of teaching styles.

A variety of approaches to dealing with the issue is evident. At least four conceptions of induction can be identified although they seldom appear in pure form. One is a workplace orientation. The focus here is on the new teacher being helped to fit into the regularities of the employing school and the district. Another perspective is that of career development. The emphasis in this case is on the new teacher becoming a "professional." Still another view is that of teachers serving and to some extent "saving" students entrusted to their care. And, finally, there is the more global view of teachers as producers of "the new raw materials of international commence," (A Nation at Risk, 1983, p. 7), as persons who serve "the progress of society itself," (p. 8).

Certain features seem to be an accepted part of most concepts of induction programs. There are almost always "orientation" sessions or

meetings which deal with workplace regularities and requirements. These include such items as where and how to obtain supplies and how and when to fill out forms and other paper work.

There is usually a helper/supporter/mentor/peer teacher (sometimes assigned, sometimes spontaneous) who deals with the new teacher one-to-one in a personal focus, helping him/her to succeed and fit in.

There are usually opportunities for learning: university classes, staff development programs, professional organization programs.

And finally, there is assessment as well as assistance by an administrator.

There is a national focus and wide-spread activity. There is variety in both concepts and programs. There are well organized in-place state-wide efforts. There are competent researchers attending to the issue.

The Model Teacher Induction Project of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas at Austin with its satellite effort is a "State of the Art" approach in the sense of representing the up-to-date knowledge available. It provides for the identification and communication of promising practices, for their implementation in various settings, and for the analytical study of the effects of that implementation.

There are many questions still unanswered and perhaps many more still unasked. There are varying, sometimes contradictory concepts regarding the nature and purpose of induction just as there are with schooling and education. There are public and political pressures and organizational constraints. There are multiple but limited resources available. And there are real people involved, both teachers and students. Progress is being made in the improvement of programs of induction. The State of the Art is

pretty good. But there are critical issues and problems to be addressed just as there are in any profession. In a soon to be published book titled Transformational Management, George Kozmetsky, director of The University of Texas Institute for Constructive Capitalism says that "solutions to critical business issues and problems now demand an integrated, holistic, flexible management that blends technological, managerial, scientific, socioeconomic, cultural and political ramifications in an atmosphere of extreme time compression." If the solutions to critical induction issues and problems are half as demanding as those of business, then the State of the Art of Induction needs to get a darn sight better. With the joint efforts of concerned and competent organizations and individuals it is going to do just that.

References

Bolam, R., Baker, K., McMahon, A., Davis, J., & McCabbe, C. (1977). The 1977 national conference on teacher induction. Bristol, England: University of Bristol, School of Education.

Feistritzer, C. E. (Ed.). (1983). The American teacher. Washington, DC: Feistritzer Publications.

Griffin, G. A. (1985). Teacher induction: Research issues. In S. M. Hord, S. F. O'Neal, & M. L. Smith (Eds.), Beyond the Looking Glass: Papers from a National Symposium on Teacher Education Policies, Practices, and Research. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Kozmetsky, G. (1985). Transformational management. Cambridge, MA: Ballenger.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

McDonald, J. (1980). The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

The nation responds. Recent efforts to improve education. (1984, May). United States Department of Education.

A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. (1983). The National Commission on Excellence in Education.

Ryan, K. (Ed.). (1970). Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ryan, K. (1974). Survival is not good enough: Overcoming the problems of beginning teachers. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tisher, R. (Ed.). (1978). The induction of beginning teachers in Australia. Melbourne, Australia: Monash University.

Wildman, T., & Borko, H. (1983, April). A conceptual model and procedures for the beginning teacher assistance program. Final report submitted to the Virginia Department of Education.

SYNOPSES OF PARTICIPANT REPORTS

Six participants were selected to make conference presentations about their induction programs. The programs selected from presentation were chosen because they represented different types of initiating agencies and diversity in types of induction programs. Brief descriptions of the programs presented along with the names and addresses of the presenters follows:

University of Kentucky
College of Education
166 Taylor Education Building
Lexington, KY 40506

Connie A. Bridge, Associate Dean
606-257-8847

The Kentucky legislature mandated that as of January 1, 1985, all teachers receiving initial certification must successfully complete the National Teachers Examinations and a one-year internship. During the internship, new teachers will be supervised and evaluated by a trained committee consisting of a resource teacher, the school principal, and a teacher educator. The resource teacher will spend a minimum of seventy hours working with the new teacher. Although the major purpose of the program is to provide guidance and support to teachers entering the profession, there is an evaluation component as well. Evaluation will be based on actual classroom observations of the new teacher using the Florida Performance Measurement System.

* * * * * * * * * *

University of Maryland/Howard County
Jeffers Hill School
6000 Tamar Drive
Columbia, MD 21045

Frank Lyman
301-596-4027

The University of Maryland Department of Curriculum and Instruction has been offering voluntary weekly Seminars for Beginning Teachers in two county school systems. The seminars use cooperative learning principles, peer observation and feedback, journaling, and action research. The department plans to extend the program to two more school systems, research the program's impact, incorporate action research into preservice coursework, and disseminate materials to other teacher educators. In cooperation with the State Department of Education, the department has also conducted an extensive study of its graduates currently in their first year of teaching to identify problems amenable to change through preservice courses and beginning teacher seminars.

Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207

Michael E. Carl
503-285-5394

The Portland State University School of Education is currently considering several models of teacher preparation that may provide alternatives to its present program of teacher education. One promising project, the Cooperative Professional Education Program, a joint venture of PSU and the Beaverton School District begun in 1982, includes preservice and beginning teacher phases. A task force is now studying the feasibility of a three-year program for beginning teachers that may include acquisition of a master's degree and standard certification. The project has been extended in association with the Portland Public School District and will begin its first year in August, 1985. The project will be extended in association with two consortia of three to five school districts during 1985-1986.

* * * * * * * * * *

Regional Educational Service Agency VI
30 G.C.& P. Road
Wheeling, WV 26003

Dr. Mary D. Marockie
233-6010

In 1980, Regional Education Service Agency VI worked cooperatively with three county school systems to develop a model beginning teacher program that could be adapted to suit each school's needs. The Ohio County school system has now expanded the model into a three-year developmental program for beginning teachers.

The first year focuses primarily on orientation to the system and school coupled with support and counseling for the new teacher by a mentor who may be a supervisor and/or department head. The second year program provides a clinical approach designed to help the teacher become more effective. Current research findings on effective teaching are used as the foundation for assisting second year teachers. Implicit to the second year are focused observations where a second year teacher observes a selected teaching behavior or strategy of a colleague. Focused supervision by a supervisor, principal, or a department head parallel the observation process.

The third year is a continuation of the clinical model. Participants observe and record behaviors of peers, are video-taped for self analysis, and are placed in a training component that focuses on improvement of classroom performance. A sequence of seminars is conducted throughout the three year training period.

RESA-VI plans to continue improving the county programs and to network with other institutions developing similar programs.

Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

Dr. Peggy Stank, Chief
Division of Teacher Preparation
and Certification
(717) 787-3470

In the state of Pennsylvania provisions for the induction of beginning teachers is a major component of the Govenor's Agenda for Excellence . . . Improving Teacher Preparation and Certification. Prior to June 1, 1987, each of the state's 501 school districts is required to submit for approval to the State Department of Education a plan for the induction experience of first year teachers. Each district's plan is required to include a mentor relationship between the first-year teacher and an induction team. In March, 1985, ten field test induction sites were selected to implement their induction plans in the 1985-86 school year. Personnel from these sites received training to assist them in developing their induction plans using state guidelines. Evaluation of the field test sites will be used to modify the state structure and guidelines for induction. It is expected that persons from the field test sites will assist in training other LEAs in the design and implementation of induction processes.

* * * * * * * * * *

American Federation of Teachers
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Marilyn Rauth, Executive Director
Educational Issues Department
202-879-4462

In addition to traditional inservice activities, the American Federation of Teachers has developed the Educational Research and Dissemination (ER & D) Program to bridge the gap between educational research and practice in the areas of classroom management and teaching effectiveness. The program has identified research useful for classroom practice, translated the research into language understandable to teachers, and trained teachers to examine research concepts, transform them into workable classroom strategies, field-test them, and disseminate findings to other teachers. Although the program does not focus exclusively on new teachers, it provides insights valuable in developing research-based preservice and inservice programs that shorten the time required for new teachers to develop effective teaching practices.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

The conference was evaluated as being successful by conference participants. Evaluations from the conference indicated that participants provided a means through which to exchange and share ideas and resources, network, learn more about the state of the art in teacher induction, and provided an atmosphere in which to begin to ask important questions. What follows are the questions asked on the evaluation form and representative comments from the conference evaluations.

1. DO YOU FEEL THIS CONFERENCE WAS A SUCCESS? IF SO, IN WHAT WAYS? IF NOT, WHY NOT?

   Yes! Although frustrated with the state of the "art" in my area, I feel confident that the concept is important. There are answers yet to be sought but at least I feel some confidence in asking the right questions!

   Definitely--very important for networking. Provided me with some important information on a number of topics that I will serve in several arenas. Well organized conference--no time wasted.

   The conference caused an awareness of those things being done nationwide in the area of induction It also provided for interaction of similar role institutions and learning about existing or planned programs. For me the conference was a success because it created the possibility of collaborative research and the option for networks and problem solving via mail and phone.

   The combination of participant reports and small group work sessions was very appropriate.

2. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE MOST VALUABLE FEATURE OF THE CONFERENCE.

   The opportunity to work with people in higher education.

   Information update on what is going on and the learning atmosphere.

   Participant reports and the wide variety of the presentations.

   Presentations concerning programs in other states.

   The cross section of participants and the interactions.

3. WAS THERE ANYTHING THAT YOU DID NOT FIND USEFUL OR HELPFUL? IF SO, WHAT?

It would have been helpful to have an "instant-print" medium to have group suggestions/input in our hands to study, make notes, etc.

A written summary of the objectives and procedures mailed out in advance would have been helpful.

Probably the second small group (discussion on the MTIP) was not needed and the sharing of group reports could have been shorter.

4. WHAT QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS DO YOU STILL HAVE THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE ADDRESSED?

More in-depth information about induction programs and processes is still needed.

How can I sell the concerns to local school districts? At some times I feel a "them against us" attitude from the superintendent and other mid-management individuals.

More specific information for actual research and more information about the research instruments already used in induction projects.

Too frequently federally funded projects are geared only to the use of money during its funded period without plans for times when money runs out. My concern is that MTIP will be just another example of many already, where project funds resulted in no long-term value.

The whole concept of mentor/master teacher concept needs more exploration.

5. WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR OUR SPRING MTIP SATELLITE CONFERENCE?

Concurrent sessions are less attractive to me, as it is impossible to get all the information. That's a plan to miss something.

Keep it small and informal. Use one well-known educational philosopher/futurist for a keynote address and small group interaction. Keep a mix of research reports and non-research implementation projects.

Involve teachers who have been mentors and new teachers and explore that whole issue and area.

Work on designing a national study of various aspects of induction with some in-depth study of "successful" programs.

MTIP SATELLITE NETWORK CONFERENCE

APRIL, 1985

Conference Overview

Forty-six participants representing 21 states and Washington D.C. gathered in Austin April 22-23, 1985 for the second MTIP Satellite Network Conference. A list of conference participants is provided in Appendix B. The theme of this conference, Mentor/Master Teachers, was generated by participants both in small group discussions and in the final summative session during the first general conference in November 1984. Similar to the first conference, this one was structured around an opening address, participant reports, and small group activities or working sessions (see agenda in Exhibit 2). The welcoming remarks and conference overview were presented by Leslie Huling-Austin, MTIP Satellite Coordinator. Following a research symposium presented by the RITE program staff on their recent teacher induction study (orginally presented at a symposium, "New Teacher Programs and Certification: Implementation and Effects of Two State Programs", American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1985), Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik presented a report from a review of recent literature on mentor teachers. A synopsis of this report is provided in the following section. A representative of the Wisconsin State Department of Education described a series of mentor teacher projects currently underway in Wisconsin, and formal presentation on four induction programs by participants were included. Brief descriptions of the programs presented are included in a later section (see page 44). These reports and presentations were intertwined with small group work sessions focusing on specific topics related to teacher induction and master/mentor teachers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exhibit 2

MTIP Satellite Conference Agenda

April 22-23, 1985

Monday, April 22

8:00	Coffee, Juice, and Pastries
8:30	Welcome & Conference Overview -- Leslie Huling-Austin
8:45	Induction Research Symposium -- RITE Program Staff
9:45	Report of Literature Review on Mentor Teachers -- Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik
10:30	Break
10:45	Report on Wisconsin State Department Activities Related to Mentor Teachers -- Kathryn Gilbert
11:45	Lunch
1:00	Small Group Work Session Focused on Mentor Teachers
2:00	Reporting Out and Focusing Activity Related to Work Groups for Tomorrow -- Leslie Huling-Austin
2:30	Report from Jefferson County, Colorado School System -- Sue Schiff and George Juarte
3:00	Report from UT Tyler -- Vivian Hicks
3:30	Break
3:45	Report on the MTIP -- John Smith and Leslie Huling-Austin
4:15	Report on Collaboration Between the MTIP and the ATE Commission on the Induction Process -- Peggy Ishler
4:30	Wrap-up
5:00	Adjourn
6:30	Dinner out with Small Groups

Tuesday, April 23

8:00	Coffee, Juice, and Pastries
8:15	Announcements
8:30	Report from Doane College (Crete, Nebraska) -- Kay Hegler
9:00	Report on North Carolina State Induction Activities -- Parmalee Hawk, East Carolina University
9:30	Instructions for Group Work
9:45	Break
10:00	Small Group Work

Suggested Topics (others may be added)

- Collaborative Research Project for 1985-86
- Selection & Training of Support Teachers
- Collaborative Effort of Professional Organizations
- How to Start an Induction Program from Square One
- State-Wide Induction Programs

11:45	Reporting Out and Conference Wrap-up
12:15	Lunch
1:00	Adjourn
1:00-3:00	Meeting of ATE Commission on the Induction Process

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Also included was a report on the MTIP given by John Smith and Leslie Huling-Austin and a report on collaboration between the MTIP and the ATE Commission on the Induction Process given by Peggy Ishler.

This conference focused on around four goals:

1) to increase understanding about the induction process for beginning teachers and to become better informed about various induction programs in operation throughout the country,

2) to specifically explore issues related to the role, selection and training of "mentor" teachers,

3) to further promote the development of a national network of educators concerned about the induction of beginning teachers, and

4) to organize and plan future collaborative activities to be conducted by network members.

A small group discussion focused on mentor teachers was guided by these focusing questions :

1) What roles can mentors fill in the induction of teachers?

2) What factors should be considered in the selection of mentor teachers?

3) a) What training do mentor teachers need?

   b) What are training activities of which you are aware?

4) What information or materials related to mentor teachers would be most helpful to you in your role in the induction process?

5) What suggestions do you have for future research regarding mentors and their interactions with novice teachers?

   (Please note: "Support teachers," "counseling teachers," "buddy teachers," "sponsor teachers," or other titles are often substituted for "mentor.")

Notes from each of the group activities were later transcribed for later use, and input from conference participants regarding induction research was solicited as a part of the planning process in the R&D Center's bid for the NIE Center on Teacher Education.

The final 1½ hours of the conference were devoted to a planning activity in which conference participants discussed the future of the network and

future network activities. Plans were made at this time to conduct during the 1985-86 school year a network collaborative study of teacher induction in diverse contexts. This study is described in Part III of this report. Other plans discussed for the network's future included that R&DCTE would continue to publish the induction quarterly newsletter and periodically disseminate other induction related information of importance, Also, the network would continue its formal relationship with the ATE Commission on the Induction Process and would continue to support commission activities. In addition, R&DCTE would continue to coordinate professional conference presentations about the network which involve network members and would organize informal meetings of the network at the annual meetings of several professional organizations including ATE and the American Educational Research Association (AERA).

A Synopsis of "Mentoring: A Review
of the Literature with a Focus on Teaching"

Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Throughout the United States, induction programs are being initiated which attempt to orient beginning teachers to the profession with greater support and guidance. Toledo, Ohio; Charlotte-Mecklenberg, North Carolina; California State Education Department; and Louisville, Kentucky are just a few large school districts and state agencies that are implementing such programs. A dominant characteristic of these programs is the appointment of an experienced teacher to assist the initiate and to help her/him understand the culture of the school. Often the support teacher is designated "mentor teacher." Responsibilities of the mentor teacher are manifold, dependent on the school district, and may include assistance with curriculum, guidance in classroom management, or even involvement in the beginner's evaluation.

In planning for induction programs, administrators and teachers will benefit from understanding the current research that exists on the complex notion of mentoring. Fragments of research on the mentor-inductee association have reached the school setting, and therefore, the purpose of this paper is twofold: (a) to review the literature on mentoring among teachers in elementary and secondary schools, and (b) to summarize what we can learn from the literature on mentoring in other professions and suggest some applications of this knowledge to induction programs in public schools.

The Derivation of the Mentor Concept

"Mentor" was derived from Homer's Odyssey, wherein Athene took the image of Mentor, Ulysses' loyal friend, and was given responsibility for nurturing Telemachus (Ulysses's son) when his father ventured off to fight the Trojan War. Therefore, the term "mentor" historically denotes a trusted guide and counselor, and the mentor-protege relationship, a deep and meaningful association. In his book, James G. Clawson admonishes, however, that the relationship between Mentor and Telemachus was not an easy one. He states ". . . it was Mentor's difficult task to help Telemachus see the error in his judgment in a way that would allow the young protege to grow in wisdom and not in rebellion" (1980, pp. 145-146). In light of its historical connotation, the unbound use of the term "mentor" for teachers in induction programs is incorrect, or at least not totally accurate. Edgar Schein (1978, p. 178) has resolved that the term, mentor, today has been used loosely to mean teacher, coach, trainer, positive role model, developer of talent, opener of doors, protector, sponsor, and successful leader.

Mentoring in Schools

Most research on mentoring has been conducted in business professions, although some has origins in adult education and academia (e.g. higher education; education for gifted students; graduate advisor and student relationships). Sharon Merriam's Mentor and Proteges: A Critical Review of the Literature (1983) is an excellent literature review highlighting research in all three areas. Merriam concluded that due to the "idiosyncratic nature" of the studies on mentoring in academic settings, little can be determined about mentoring among teachers (p. 169).

Few studies have been published which focus on teacher-teacher relationships and the phenomenon of mentoring in elementary and secondary

schools. Two exceptions are studies by Nathalie Gehrke and Richard S. Kay (1984) and Michael Fagan and Glen Walters (1982). Gehrke and Kay investigated the presence of mentoring among teachers and the nature of the mentored relationship. These authors cautiously used the terms mentor and protege to denote relationships which were positive and healthy. They distinguished mentors especially from the neutral term sponsor, which indicated a less comprehensive relationship, containing less favorable elements. The evolution of the association was described as were the benefits of the mentor-protege connection. The results of the study revealed that of the 188 teachers who responded to the questionnaire, 111 indicated having known a person who had "helped, guided, or sponsored them" in the teaching profession (p. 21). The 41 interviewed teachers who claimed a mentor relationship said their mentors were college professors/supervisors, school principals, and former teachers; only three indicated a co-worker. The study disclosed that few of the interviewed teachers became mentors for other teachers at any point in the preparation and induction period, even though they expressed a desire to do so.

Fagan and Walters conducted a survey which asked 107 public school teachers and a comparison group of 70 police officers and 87 nurses to evaluate and report their experiences as mentors and proteges in informal relationships. Employing a liberal definition of mentoring as "an experienced adult who befriends and guides a less experienced adult . . . one who can offer support, advice, and opportunity to a young adult," the researchers designed their study to assess the frequency and nature of mentoring in teaching and to examine relationships between mentoring and job satisfaction, job burnout and an assortment of vaguely defined personal characteristics and skills such as "tactfulness" and "learning how to work

with people". Furthermore, the design of the study must be questioned because the authors failed to demonstrate a convincing rationale for comparing experiences of police officers, nurses and teachers. The Fagan and Walters study leaves the reader with merely a vague notion that mentoring, based on their own boundless definition, was prevalent among public high school teachers.

Judy Arin Krupp (1984) reports in "Mentor and Protege Perceptions of Mentoring Relationships in Elementary and Secondary Schools in Connecticut" that a series of eight workshops designed to foster mentoring relationships in order to ensure staff growth and development had positive results. Krupp confirms that although mentoring was occurring in the schools before the project started, the workshops caused older teachers to acknowledge their own sense of self-worth, form new friendships, and provide assistance -- professional and personal -- for young teachers.

Building on recent findings on induction and staff development, researchers at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin are conducting a pilot study of the Model Teacher Induction Project (MTIP). Participants in the MTIP project were first year teachers at the middle school level, teaching in the core academic subjects (language arts, math, science, or social studies) and their support teachers who were selected by the school principal. The project was designed to address common needs of beginning and support teachers, and tailored to emerging needs as the year progresses. Although the MTIP is a small study and data analysis is still in progress, preliminary findings suggest that the involvement of a support or peer teacher is a valuable aspect of an induction program. In addition, the support teacher must be perceived by the principal as a successful teacher;

the productive mentor-new teacher relationship is most likely to develop when the two teachers instruct similar grade levels and content, and when their classrooms are located in the same area of the building. The researchers found two other criteria to be beneficial in the pairing process: the first year teacher and support teacher must have compatible ideologies about teaching and the first year teacher should understand and accept the need for a support teacher arrangement. Finally, induction programs should include a provision for the formal involvement of the school principal (Huling-Austin, Barnes, & Smith, 1985).

Linda Lambert (1985) advises that "teachers need mentors" in her paper, Teacher Preparation and Inservice: An Urgent Agenda. Lambert's list describes the skills of mentoring and compares a list of essential elements of adult learning. Her comprehensive inventory of mentor characteristics is a substantive reference for teachers/administrators to consult if designing a formal or informal program.

Research on Mentoring in Other Professions

Undeniably the literature on mentoring among teachers is limited, and as educators, we must look toward other disciplines, such as business or adult development, where an extensive body of research on mentoring exists. The adaptability of the data is certain. As Cyril O'Houle has stated, "Professions are notable for the nurturance they provide to their mentors, beginning with the mentor-novice relationship that characterizes at least part of basic education and proceeding through a lifetime of colleagueship and supervision" (1979, p. 112). This section presents research conducted in other fields which might be useful to teachers or administrators involved or considering involvement in a mentor program.

Generic studies of mentoring have focused on a range of professionals and subjects. Elizabeth Alleman and Isadora Newman's study "Interpersonal Perceptions in Mentoring Relationships" examines actual and perceived similarity and contrast within mentor pairs. Findings indicate that mentors and proteges are not necessarily similar in measured personality characteristics or background factors. "Mentoring as a Learning Experience for Adults" by Breda Murphy Bova and Rebecca Phillips (1984) provides the analysis of their survey to determine how proteges learn from their mentors. Findings specify that proteges learn risk-taking behaviors, communication skills, political skills, and skills related to their professions (Bova & Phillips, 1984, p. 18). "Mentors: Teachers Who Make a Difference" by Laurent A. Daloz (1983), is rhetorical in nature, however, it presents guidelines for the mentor to follow while engaged in the relationship. Kaoru Yamamoto (1985) addresses mentoring as a human experience and focuses on "numinosity" -- the delicate dialectical function -- "to be seen and to be listened to and to listen." Yamamoto's research provides an interpretation of the phenomenon in light of human maturation and the tendency need for recognition. Specific recommendations for teachers in the mentor-protege relationship are not offered by any of these authors.

A foundation study in the field of adult development was Daniel Levinson's Seasons of a Man's Life (1978) in which he states: "The mentor relationship is one of the most developmentally important relationships a person can have in early adulthood" (p. 97). He offered a comprehensive and insightful definition of mentoring in its truest sense:

> The mentor may act as a teacher to enhance the younger man's skills and intellectual development. Serving as a sponsor, he may use his influence to promote the young man's entry and advancement. He may be

> a host and guide, welcoming the initiate into a new occupational and social world and acquainting him with its values, customs, resources, and cast of characters. Through his own virtues, achievement, and way of life, the mentor may be an exemplar that the protege can admire and seek to emulate. He may provide counsel and moral support in times of stress. (1978, p. 98)

Levinson likened poor mentoring in early adulthood to that of poor parenting in childhood and suggested a young person's entry into the adult world may be hindered without engaging in the relationship.

Breda Murphy Bova and Rebecca R. Phillips have noted that most persons become proteges at the early adult phase or at the mid-life transition phase of the life cycle (i.e., when career changes occur) (1982). This finding is particularly significant for understanding the transition period teachers may potentially experience in the "early adult phase" as they progress through their first year, unless teaching is engaged as a second career. Mentoring teachers, on the other hand, if older, may undergo what Erik Erikson (1963) terms "generativity vs. stagnation". Consistent with Erikson's thought, Schmidt and Wolfe (1980) suggest mentorship is one way in which older workers may understand the significance of their lives and professional contributions. Kram (1983) notes that, "Individuals may feel challenged, stimulated, and creative in providing mentoring functions as they become 'senior adults' with wisdom to share" (p. 609). Erikson, Schmidt and Wolfe, and Kram's research is significant for Krupp's study cited earlier.

Other studies in non-education fields provide valuable points of reference for understanding the complex associations involved in mentor-intern relationships in schools. Hunt and Michael (1983) indicate

that the mentor's age, gender, organization position, power, and self-confidence are the most commonly cited characteristics in discussing the nature of the relationship. Levinson (1978) notes that the mentor who "serves the traditional function" is usually older than the protege by a half-generation (8-15 years). Age differences much greater than this, Levinson cautions, pose special hazards:

> When the mentor is a full generation older -- say twenty years or more -- there is a greater risk that the relationship will be symbolized by both in parent-child terms. This tends to activate powerful feelings, such as excessive maternalism or paternalism in the elder, and dependency or Oedipal conflicts in the younger, that interfere with the mentoring function. When the age difference is less than 6-8 years, the two are likely to experience each other as peers. They may be intimate friends or collaborative co-workers, but the mentorship aspects tend to be minimal. (Levinson, 1978, p. 99)

Weber notes that "the mentor-protege interaction synthesizes characteristics of the parent-child relation and peer friendship without being either" (1980, p. 20). He suggests that the mentor accept the protege as an equal and a friend, yet their differences in age and experience means they are not peers. He states:

> The relationship more closely resembles peer friendship when the parties are closer in age and experience, parent-child when the gap between their ages is greater. In either case, mentoring is a nurturing relationship between two adults without implication that the protege is treated like a child. (Weber, 1980, p. 20)

Kram (1983) suggests yet another dimension concerning age and role of the mentor. She verifies that mentor relationships provide career and

psychosocial functions for mentors in mid-life. These psychosocial functions are dependent on the degree of trust, mutuality and intimacy that characterize the relationship.

In addition to age and role, gender is also an important trait that influences the mentor-protege relationship. Male-female mentoring relationships have special complexities. Female proteges often experience overprotectiveness, greater social distance, and general discomfort in male-mentored relationships (Kram, 1983). In male-female mentoring relationships, both participants must deal with sexual tensions and fears, public scrutiny, and stereotypical male-female roles (Hunt & Michael, 1983).

The qualities of the mentor will affect the character of the mentor-protege relationship. Hanson (1983) has identified variations in mentor types and effects of these variations on mentor-protege relationships. Consistent with Alleman and Newman (1984), Zey (1984) reports that strong interpersonal relationships do not always characterize the mentor relationship. Most mentor relationships in his study of managers in large and small corporations were not close nor were the relationships based on common outside interests. The pairs were not of the same social background, nor had the same type of schooling. The crucial component was their ability to work together. "Working together" was based on "mutual trust, respect, and a belief in each other's ability to perform competently" (p. 173). Zey posits that over time chemistry emerges between two people who work together toward a common goal:

> Chemistry is often a result, not a cause of the mentor-protege connection; that mentor relationships develop on a much more functional basis than chemistry; and the ability to fulfill a work role emerges

as a more important determinant of mentor relationships than personality mesh. (Zey, 1984, p. 174)

Shapiro, Haseltime, and Rowe (1978) addressed the nature of the relationship in which roles progress from the initial and casual "peer-pal" to that of "guide" whereby "pitfalls" and "shortcuts" of the organization were acknowledged. The "guide" function evolves to that of sponsor and eventually "mentor" -- "the most intense and 'paternalistic' of the types of patrons described by the continuum" (p. 55). Kram (1983) also notes that in the mentor-protege association, the relationship is likely to pass through a series of phases:

> The initiation stage during which time the relationship is started; a cultivation phase, during which time the range of functions provided expands to maximum; a separation phase, during which time the established nature of the relationship is substantially altered by structural change in the organizational context and/or by psychological changes with one or both individuals; and a redefinition stage, during which time the relationship evolves a new form that is significantly different from the past, or the relationship ends entirely. (Kram, 1983, p. 614)

Although the mentor-protege relationships in teaching may not advance through the same stages, they may be similar.

For those teachers already acting as mentors, work by Jane Bensahel offers five warnings in reference to directing the protege:

> Don't assume the relationships you have developed successfully in the organization [the school] will work equally well for your protege.
>
> Ensure that your protege is not dazzled by your influence.
>
> Don't try too hard to shield your protege from mistakes that are bound to happen through experience.

Don't burden your protege with too great a sense of gratitude.

Avoid confining your protege's growth potential to your own limitations. (Bensahel, 1977, pp. 44-46)

While Bensahel's work was not conducted in educational settings, her advice appears to be useful to teachers acting as mentors.

Administrators and/or teachers seeking to institute a formal mentor-protege program in their school districts will benefit from substantive guidelines Linda Phillips-Jones provides in "Establishing a Formalized Mentoring Program" (1983). Her recommendations suggest ensuring top management (administration) duly support and publicize the program and that participation in the program be voluntary with a 6-month time period for the first mentoring cycle. Phillips-Jones' research on mentors and proteges could serve as a valuable resource to educators in achieving a better understanding of the intricacies of establishing formal mentor programs that work. A less formal plan for encouraging spontaneous mentoring relationships is suggested by Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, and Newman (1984). These authors propose that a developmental group for potential mentors be formed and that separate educative sessions be designed to focus on such topics as: benefits of the mentor relationship, ways to increase the protege's self-esteem, and adapting mentoring practices to a particular setting while gaining organization-wide support.

Conclusions

Despite the small numbers of studies of mentoring in school settings, some studies provide insights into the mentoring-protege relationship, and this research is relevant for those desiring to enhance or create induction programs. What we know is that many teachers benefit from mentoring relationships at least in an informal manner although they are not necessarily mentored by fellow teachers. Also, it appears that while many

teachers are desirous of the position of mentor, relatively few have assumed the role. Finally, Krupp's research suggests that workshops on effective mentoring can potentially enhance staff growth and development, causing older effective teachers to recognize the culmination of their years of experience in the profession and provide beginning teachers with some needed assistance in their first year.

Teachers and administrators interested in perpetuating such an association will find it helpful to utilize the knowledge acquired from other professions. Clearly a mentor, in the truest sense of the word, cannot be assigned to a beginning teacher in an induction program. A mentor-protege pair connotes a voluntary and deep relationship, not limited to basic direction and encouragement (which more characterizes the responsibilities of a coach). However, if mentors are volunteers, if pairs are selected wisely, and if the protege is assigned a "mentor" teacher for a 6-month cycle, there will be a possibility for establishment of an eventual nurturing relationship.

Recommendations suggest the relationship be voluntary and that the age and gender factors be considered in establishing the pair. After the pair engages in work activities for 6 months -- visualizing a common goal - "chemistry" then dictates the potential for continuing the association. Evident is that if the relationship persists, it will evolve through varied stages -- each of which is unique to the protege's development. For those teachers/administrators developing induction programs in their school districts, guidelines offered by Linda Phillips-Jones (1983) or Alleman et al. (1984) might be incorporated into their master design. Certainly, it would be to the educator's advantage to continue researching the mentor-protege phenomena among teachers, making use of the knowledge

derived from other disciplines. The vital role allocated the "mentor teacher" in the induction process necessitates a greater understanding of the potential for this association and it's subsequent impact on the education of beginning teachers in our elementary and secondary schools.

References

Alleman, E., & Newman, I. (1984, April). Interpersonal perceptions in mentoring relationships. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Alleman, E., Cochran, J., Doverspike, J., & Newman, I. (1984). Enriching mentoring relationships. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62(6), 329-332.

Bensahel, J. G. (1977). Let your protege make his own way. International Management, 32(5), 44-46.

Bova, B. M., & Phillips, R. R. (1982, November). The mentoring relationship as an educational experience. Paper presented at the National Conference of the Adult Education Association of the U. S. A., San Antonio, TX.

Bova, B. M., & Phillips, R. R. (1984). Mentoring as a learning experience for adults. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 16-20.

Clawson, J. G. (1980). Mentoring in managerial careers. In C. B. Derr (Ed.), Work, family and the career. (pp. 144-165). New York: Praeger.

Daloz, L. A. (1983). Mentors: Teachers who make a difference. Change, 15(6), 24-27.

Erickson, E. (1963). Childhood and society. New York: W. N. Norton & Co.

Fagan, M. M., & Walters, G. (1982). Mentoring among teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 76(2), 113-117.

Gehrke, N. J., & Kay, R. S. (1984). The socialization of beginning teachers through mentor-protege relationships. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 21-24.

Hanson, P. A. (1983). Protege perceptions of the mentor-protege relationship: Its complementary nature and developmental tasks. (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin - Madison). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44(11-B), 3509.

Huling-Austin, L., Barnes, S., & Smith, J. (1985, April). A research-based development program for beginning teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hunt, D. M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. Academy of Management Review, 8(3), 475-485.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 608-625.

Krupp, J. A. (1984, April). Mentor and protege perceptions of mentoring relationships in an elementary and secondary school in Connecticut. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Lambert, L. (1985, April). Adult learning, teacher preparation and inservice: An urgent agenda. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Levinson, D. J. (1978). Seasons of a man's life. New York: Knopf.

Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and proteges: a critical review of the literature. Adult Education Quarterly, 33(3), 161-173.

O'Houle, C. (1979). Continuing learning in the professions. San Francisco: Fossey-Bass.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1983). Establishing a formalized mentoring program. Training and Development Journal, 37(2), 38-42.

Schein, E. (1978). Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schmidt, J. A., & Wolfe, J. S. (1980). The mentor partnership: Discovery of professionalism. NASPA, 17(3), 45-51.

Shapiro, E. C., Haseltine, F. P., & Rowe, M. P. (1978). Moving up: Role models, mentors, and the "patron system". Sloan Management Review, 19(3), 51-58.

Weber, C. E. (1980). Mentoring. Directors and Boards. 5(3), 17-24.

Yamamoto, K. (1985, April). Mentoring as a human experience. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Zey, M. G. (1984). The mentor connection. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

SYNOPSES OF PARTICIPANT REPORTS

Five participants were selected to make conference presentations about their induction programs. The programs selected for presentation were chosen because they represented different types of initiating agencies and diversity in types of induction programs. Further, most of the programs presented had mentor teacher components included in them. Brief descriptions of the programs presented along with the names and addresses of the presenters follow.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707

Kathryn Gilbert, Director
Teaching Incentives Pilot Program
608/267-2003

Wisconsin responded to the challenge of the final report of the task force on teaching and teacher education with the establishment in December, 1984 of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program. The goal of the program is to plan, develop, and administer a series of pilot projects which model different types of incentives designed to attract, prepare, and retain competent teachers. These include:

a) incentives and innovations for training new teachers and for staff development;
b) incentives for retaining teachers in their profession through the development of career ladder structures;
c) incentives for retaining teachers through monetary and nonmonetary awards; and
d) combinations which link the three levels of incentives

Implementation of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program was divided into two phases. The first phase was the planning, communication, and orientation of the program which then allowed school districts in the state to make application to participate in the program. Eight sites were selected as pilot sites. The second phase involved transition from planning to implementation of the actual pilot program. This phase included the following components: 1) Master/Mentor Teacher Development Program; 2) Field-Test of a First-Year Teacher Induction Program; and 3) Technical Assistance/Information Dissemination.

Jefferson County Public Schools
1209 Quail Street
Lakewood, CO 80215

George Juarta
Assistant to the North
Area Superintendent
(303) 422-3454

Sue Schiff
Staff Development Specialist
(303) 231-2391

Teachers helping teachers is the focus of Jefferson County's North Area School District's new program geared toward making new teachers effective in the classroom. While the district's new teacher training program held each fall has received national recognition there was some concern that not enough was being done for the new teacher over the long run. The Master Teacher program is designed to fill that gap. The Master Teacher Program pairs 17 experienced, creative Jefferson County teachers with newcomers to the profession. Through group and one-to-one training sessions the master teachers serve as advisors and confidants to their less experienced peers. Master teachers receive 3½ days of training in various aspects including knowledge of district curriculum, knowledge of the change process, knowledge of effective teaching practices, classroom management procedures, effective instruction, and consulting skills.

The goals of the program include:

a. to assist new teachers in delivering the R-1 curriculum
b. to assist new teachers in whatever area needs assistance
c. to provide ongoing, nonevaluative support for new teachers
d. to acknowledge that the organization cares about the development of quality teachers, and
e. to provide the coaching necessary for change in behavior.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Doane College
Education Division
Crete, Nebraska 68333

Kay Hegler
402-826-2161

In 1982, the Education Division of Doane College initiated a pilot program of professional development for Doane College graduates in their first year of teaching. The program is expanding and will be required of all graduates with secondary education and special education majors and offered as an elective for elementary education majors beginning in 1986-87. Under the program, beginning teachers are observed in the classroom by their Doane College student teaching supervisors and receive three days of supervision and assistance from a master teacher. Areas of need are identified and used to provide on-site inservice training and to revise the college preservice program. Inservice may be taken for graduate credit if the teacher wishes.

East Carolina University
School of Education
Speight Building, Room 154
Greenville, N.C. 27834

Dr. Parmalee P. Hawk
757-6272

In 1982, the East Carolina University School of Education conducted a one-year beginning teachers pilot program to gather data on the needs of new teachers, test the effectiveness of three-member teacher support teams, and assess the costs of statewide implementation of the program. After extensive piloting the State of North Carolina will implement a statewide two year Initial Certification Program (ICP) in July, 1985. Successful completion of the ICP will be verified by the local school system and recommendations for continuing certification will be made by each system's superintendent.

* * * * * * * * * *

The University of Texas at Tyler
3900 University Blvd.
Tyler, TX 75701

Dr. Joanna Martin and Dr. Vivian Hicks
214-566-1471

The University of Texas at Tyler School of Education is currently operating a one-year program for teachers entering classrooms for the first time in the East Texas area. The program will continue for the 1985-1986 school year. Region VII Education Service Center has endorsed the program and provides dissemination of enrollment information and opportunities for feedback to participating schools.

Beginning teachers participating in the program received three hours graduate credit and met on the campus for regular classes. The University provides a $50.00 tuition/fee stipend. Books and the remaining fees are paid by the school districts. Of the thirty-four participants in the 1984-85 program thirty were required to attend in order to be hired by their school district.

Curriculum for the program is based on a needs assessment done with second year teachers and the participants themselves.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Once again the conference participants indicated that the conference was a success. Participants also identified the most valuable features of the conference and offered suggestions for improving future sessions. Finally, they shared questions and concerns that they would like to have addressed by the induction network in the future. Representative comments follow.

1. DO YOU FEEL THIS CONFERENCE WAS A SUCCESS? IF SO, IN WHAT WAYS? IF NOT, WHY NOT?

   Yes, it was very well organized--good materials were disseminated, and it stimulated much thought and discussion. There was beneficial sharing among participants.

   Yes, sometimes, each of us feels that we are the only state experiencing problems or concerns concerning beginning teachers--to hear and discuss with others is supportive.

   The reports of the variety of teacher induction programs were helpful. Building a network of people who have knowledge and experience in teacher induction is important.

   Yes, and yet frustrating due to the fact that my university has done little to initiate an induction process nor do they "act" interested. It has provided me with an excellent information base.

   The background and experience of participants was diverse and rich. Being able to discuss ideas and share perceptions gave this conference a unique dimension. The small group session on Monday was very productive in identifying roles for support teachers and suggestions for selection and training.

2. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE MOST VALUABLE FEATURE OF THE CONFERENCE.

   The collaborative research group.

   Information and data from center staff reports and their leadership in pulling it together. Sharing the variety of existing teacher induction efforts, their elements and effectiveness to date.

   The review of the literature was particularly helpful in that it interpreted research findings and provided knowledge about specific programs.

Interacting, sharing and learning, particularly about research being done in various area and states and about programs in other states.

3. WAS THERE ANYTHING THAT YOU DID NOT FIND USEFUL OR HELPFUL? IF SO, WHAT?

My only concern is that mainstream LEA's be advised of the concepts and progress made in the effort.

I would have preferred the small group sessions to be across job lines.

Day one was a bit long. I realize that time and finances are prohibitive, but other than that, it was highly beneficial.

4. WHAT QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS DO YOU HAVE THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE ADDRESSED BY THE INDUCTION NETWORK IN THE FUTURE?

Continue to keep us informed of the opportunities to present and publish.

I'm concerned about the continuation of the network and dissemination of information among participants. Also, how to evaluate a support techer and how to prevent old-boy-network influence in selecting support teachers.

Can we continue to develop the distinction between institutionalized "mentoring" from professional mentoring--the system vs. the natural? We need to look at the differences between mandated and voluntary programs, also at the implications of induction programs for preparation programs. Are we doing what could be done prior to induction?

I think it's only natural to ask, "what comes after induction?" What are the ripple effects of induction, both positive and negative. Is the induction process influenced by whether or not the teaching position is a high-demand position?

NETWORK COLLABORATIVE STUDY

ON TEACHER INDUCTION IN DIVERSE CONTEXTS

At the April MTIP Satellite Network Conference participants decided to conduct a collaborative research project during the 1985-86 school year. Network members believed that such a project would be worthwhile because it would 1) provide the opportunity for a national teacher induction study to be conducted in a large number of diverse settings with a large sample of first-year teachers, and 2) provide individuals with the opportunity to conduct research in collaboration with their colleagues and in conjunction with an national R & D Center.

On June 6-7, 1984, two network members, Parmalee Hawk of East Carolina University and Sondra Odell of the University of New Mexico came to the Center to work with the MTIP staff to plan this study. The study was designed with three major considerations in mind. First, the study should take full advantage of the unique opportunity to collect data for a variety of sites and a large number of first-year teachers. Second, the data collection must be manageable for site researchers, both those participating only in this study and those participating in the study as one portion of their total research endeavor. Third, the research questions should focus across sites as well as provide sufficient single-site information to be of value to the individual researcher.

Once the study design and data collection schedule were initially formulated, it was sent to three more network members for their review and input. Reviewers included Francisco Hidalgo, California State University at Long Beach; Sue Schiff, Jefferson County (Colorado) School District; and Doug Brooks, Miami University (Oxford, Ohio).

Participants from approximately 35 institutions are represented in the collaborative study. A list of participating individuals and institutions is shown in Exhibit 3. The study is being managed by R&DCTE and network members are participating as site researchers by collecting data in their own sites and contributing it to the national data base being compiled at the Center. The research questions being addressed in the study are shown in Exhibit 4.

Using a variety of questionnaires, interview and forms to be completed by the researcher, the data collection focuses on (a) demographics of the school, district and first-year teacher; (b) a description of the induction program and documentation of induction activities and interventions; (c) investigation of needs, concerns, and attitudes of first-year teachers; and (d) the study of the selection, training and evaluation of support teachers. Two levels of data collection were designed into the study. All site researchers must participate in the collection of core data, to be gathered through forms and questionnaires. In addition, the site researchers are encouraged to participate in a more intensive data collection through interviewing a selected number of first-year teachers. Researchers may also choose to collect data they personally would find interesting. A graphic display of the data collection schedule is shown in Exhibit 5.

Analysis of the data base will be coordinated by R&DCTE and will involve various network members. In addition, all site researchers in the study may have access to the collective data base in order to do additional analyses on portions of the data in which they are particularly interested. The Center will also be coordinating professional conference presentations and various publications about the collaborative study which will involve network members as co-presenters and co-authors.

Exhibit 3
Participants in the Collaborative Study
of Induction in Diverse Contexts

Institutions of Higher Education

Dick Arends, Hilda Borko, and Frank Lyman
University of Maryland

Connie Bridge, Associate Dean
University of Kentucky

Burl Brim, Teacher Education Faculty
Southern Oregon State College

Mike Carl, Dean
Portland University

Bob Goodall, Professor
Illinois State University

Parmalee Hawk, Clinical Professor
East Carolina University

Kay L. Hegler, Assistant Professor
Doane College

Vivian Hicks, Professor
The University of Texas at Tyler

Francisco Hidalgo, Professor of Teacher Education
California State University at Long Beach

John Johnston, Associate Professor
Memphis State University

Ralph J. Kester, Teacher Education Faculty
Greenville College, Illinois

Georgea Mohlman Sparks, Assistant Professor
Eastern Michigan University

Alfonso Nava, Assistant Professor
California State University at Los Angeles

Margaret Needels, Assistant Professor
University of Montana

Kirk Nigro, Educational Administration Coordinator
Eastern New Mexico University

Sondra Odell, Graduate Intern and Teacher Education Consultant
University of New Mexico

William H. Peters, Professor and Department Head
Texas A&M University

Shirley Robards, Chair of Professional Education
University of Tulsa

Carol Schwartz and John Bullock, Education Faculty
University of South Florida

John J. Smith, Director of Teacher Education
Goshen College

Lois Thies-Sprinthall, Professor
North Carolina State University

John White, Assistant Professor
Austin College

Judy Willard, Associate Professor
Auburn University at Montgomery

Delores M. Wolfe, Assistant Professor
University of North Carolina

School Districts

Stephanie Hirsh, Staff Development and Free Enterprise Education Consultant
Richardson, TX

Russell Johnson, Assistant Superintendent
Dardanelle, AR

Sue Schiff, Staff Development Coordinator
Jefferson County, CO

National, State, or Regional Organizations

Kathryn Gilbert, Director of Teaching Incentives Pilot Program
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Peggy Ishler, Chair, ATE Commission on the Induction Process
Bowling Green State University

Nancy N. Loposer, Teacher Education Advisor
Alabama State Department of Education

Mary Marockie, Research Coordinator
Regional Education Service Center, Wheeling, WV

Peggy L. Stank, Chief, Teacher Education Division
Pennsylvania Department of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exhibit 4

Research Questions

Collaborative Study of Induction in Diverse Contexts

A. Individual Sites

1. What are FYT's [first year teachers] perceptions of students, themselves as teachers, the school system in which they are teaching and the teaching profession? (What are their perceptions of their teaching practices?)*

2. What needs/concerns do FYT's have? How do they change over time?

3. How do FYT's perceive induction programs to influence their teaching practices?

4. What contextual factors influence the induction process of beginning teachers and the implementation of induction program components?

5. What is the retention rate of FYT's who participated in induction programs?

6. How are ST's [support teachers] selected, trained, evaluated and compensated? What are the roles of ST's? (What is the nature [process, content, effects] of the ST/FYT interactions?)*

B. Across Sites

7. What are the similarities and differences between induction programs conducted in various settings? What factors account for these differences?

8. In what ways do assistance interventions delivered to FYT's vary across settings, and for what reasons?

9. How does the training, selection, role, evaluation and compensation of ST's vary across sites?

10. What influence does context have on needs/concerns of FYT's and on the implementation of various induction program components?

*Questions in parentheses are likely to be applicable only in sites where the researcher interviews FYT's.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exhibit 5

Data Collection

	Beginning of Year (first 2 weeks)	Middle of Year (first 2 weeks after break for winter holidays)	End of Year (last 3 weeks)
Core Data (to be collected at all sites)	SoC FYT information form Information form for researcher to complete Intervention Documentation Form	SoC Intervention Documentation Form	SoC Intervention Documentation Form FYT Questionnaire
Expanded Data (to be collected at sites where researcher chooses to interview FYT)	FYT Interview	FYT Interview	FYT Interview
Other Data Collection Possibilities (to be collected by individuals--will not be part of the shared data)	Support Teacher Interviews, Classroom Observations, FYT Journals, etc.	Support Teacher Interviews, Classroom Observations, FYT Journals, etc.	Support Teacher Interviews, Classroom Observations, FYT Journals, etc.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Participants
MTIP Satellite Conference
November 1-2, 1984
Austin, Texas

Richard Arends
College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Anita Baker
School of Education
Baylor University
Waco, TX 76798

Tom Baker
Department of Education
Box E
Austin College
Sherman, TX 75090

Connie Bridge
Associate Dean
College of Education
166 Taylor Education Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Douglas M. Brooks
Associate Professor
Center for Professional
Teacher Education
University of Texas at Arlington
P.O. Box 19227
Arlington, TX 76017

Mike Carl
School of Education
Portland University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Dale Carmichael
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701

Julia-Rosa Emslie
School of Education
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, NM 88130

Donna Gollnick
AACTE
One Dupont Circle
Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036

Bob Goodall
Professor of Education
Department of Curriculum and
Instruction
DeGarmo Hall 221
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

Clifton Harris
Office of Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Dallas
P.O. Box 830688
Richardson, TX 75083

Parmalee Hawk
School of Education
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27834

Dick Haynes
Assistant Superintendent
Tarboro City Schools
P.O Box 370
Tarboro, NC 27886

Bert Heger
Professor, Teacher Education
College of Education
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968

Kay L. Hegler
Education Division
Doane College
Crete, NB 68333

Vivian Hicks
Professor, School of Education
University of Texas at Tyler
3900 University Blvd.
Tyler, TX 75701

Francisco Hidalgo
Professor of Teacher Education
California State University,
Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90840

Stephanie Hirsh
Consultant, Staff Development
Richardson ISD
400 S. Greenville Avenue
Richardson, TX 75081

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

W. Robert Houston
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
College of Education
University of Houston, Central Campus
Houston, TX 77004

Peggy Ishler
Chair, ATE Commission
414 Education Building.
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403

Russell Johnson
Associate Professor
Division of Education
University of Texas
at Permian Basin
Odessa, TX 79762

Nancy N. Loposer
Teacher Education Advisor
Alabama State Department
of Education
347 State Office Building
Montgomery, AL 36130

Frank Lyman
5418 Killingworth Way
Columbia, MD 21044
(University of Maryland)

Mary Marockie
Regional Education Service Agency
30 G C & P Road
Wheeling, WV 26003

Joanna Martin
Professor, Field Experiences
School of Education
University of Texas at Tyler
3900 University Blvd.
Tyler, TX 75701

Marcia Nash
Center for Elementary, Secondary
and Early Childhood
University of Maine at Farmington
104 Main Street
Farmington, ME 04938

Carolyn Nelson
Office of Teacher Certification
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205

Kirk Nigro
School of Education
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, NM 88130

William H. Peters
Head, Department of Educational C&I
Texas A&M University
308 Harrington Education Center
College Station, TX 77843

Marilyn Rauth
Executive Director
Educational Issues Department
American Federation of Teachers
555 New Jersey Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20001

Phil Robinson
President, ASCD
Principal
Clarence B. Sabbath School
340 Frazier Street
River Rouge, MI 48218

John J. Smith
Director of Teacher Education
Goshen College
Goshen, IN 46526

Peggy L. Stank
Chief, Teacher Education Division
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Cindy Stevenson
Lerger Elementary School
9050 Field Street
Bloomfield, CO 80020

R&D Center Participants

Susan Barnes, RITE Program
Sara Edwards, RITE Program
Ed Emmer, RCLT Program
Dan Gallegos, RITE Program
Frank Gonzales, SITE Program
Leslie Huling-Austin, RIP Program
Ana Juarez, RIP Program
Holly Martin, SITE Program
Jan Nespor, RCLT Program
Margaret Paulissen, RITE Program
Julie Sanford, RCLT Program

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

Participants
MTIP Satellite Conference
April 22-23, 1985
Austin, Texas

Richard Arends
College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Anita Baker
School of Education
Baylor University
Waco, TX 76798

Susan Barnes
Director, Teacher Appraisal Program
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Connie Bridge
Associate Dean
College of Education
166 Taylor Education Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Douglas M. Brooks
Associate Professor
Center for Professional
Teacher Education
University of Texas at Arlington
P.O. Box 19227
Arlington, TX 76017

Mike Carl
School of Education
Portland University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Kathryn Gilbert
22 S. Strathfield Circle
Madison, WI 53717
(Wisconsin Department
of Public Instruction)

Bob Goodall
Professor of Education
Department of Curriculum and
Instruction
DeGarmo Hall 221
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

Parmalee Hawk
School of Education
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27834

Dick Haynes
Assistant Superintendent
Tarboro City Schools
P.O Box 370
Tarboro, NC 27886

Kay L. Hegler
Education Division
Doane College
Crete, NB 68333

Vivian Hicks
Professor, School of Education
University of Texas at Tyler
3900 University Blvd.
Tyler, TX 75701

Francisco Hidalgo
Professor of Teacher Education
California State University, Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90840

Stephanie Hirsh
Consultant, Staff Development
Richardson ISD
400 S. Greenville Avenue
Richardson, TX 75081

Peggy Ishler
Chair, ATE Commission
414 Education Building.
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403

Russell Johnson
Associate Professor
Division of Education
University of Texas at Permian Basin
Odessa, TX 79762

George Juarta
Jefferson County Public Schools
1209 Quail Street
Lakewood, CO 80215

Dr.Richard Kay
149-B MCKB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Nancy N. Loposer
Teacher Education Advisor
Alabama State Department
of Education
347 State Office Building
Montgomery, AL 36130

Carolyn Luttrell
Office of Teacher Certification
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205

Frank Lyman
5418 Killingworth Way
Columbia, MD 21044
(University of Maryland)

Mary Marockie
Regional Education Service Agency
30 G C & P Road
Wheeling, WV 26003

Marcia Nash
Center for Elementary, Secondary
and Early Childhood
University of Maine at Farmington
104 Main Street
Farmington, ME 04938

Kirk Nigro
School of Education
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, NM 88130

Sondra Odell
Department of Curriculum
and Instruction
Mesa Vista 2023
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

William H. Peters
Head, Department of Educational C&I
Texas A&M University
308 Harrington Education Center
College Station, TX 77843

Phil Robinson
President, ASCD
Principal, Clarence B. Sabbath School
340 Frazier Street
River Rouge, MI 48218

Sue Schiff
Resource Specialist
The Staff Academy
Jefferson County Public Schools
1209 Quail Street
Lakewood, CO 80215

John J. Smith
Director of Teacher Education
Goshen College
Goshen, IN 46526

Peggy L. Stank
Chief, Teacher Education Division
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Jack Stone
Midland ISD
702 North N Street
Midland, TX 79704

Wes Tolliver
Principal
Oak Hills Elementary School
P.O. Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

John White
Director of Field Placement
Department of Education
Austin College
Sherman, TX 75090

Delores M. Wolfe
Department of Educational
Leadership and Development
College of Human Development
and Learning
University of North Carolina
Charlotte, NC 28223

Rita C. Wyatt
New Teacher Coordinator
Birmingham Board of Education
P.O. Drawer 10007
Birmingham, AL 35202

R&D Center Participants

Sara Edwards, RITE Program
Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik, RCLT Program
Gene Hall, Director, R&D Center
Jim Hoffman, RITE Program
Shirley Hord, RIP Program
Robert Howsam, Senior Scholar
Leslie Huling-Austin, SITE Program
Sheila Murphy, RIP Program
Margaret Paulissen, RITE Program
Julie Sanford, RCLT Program
John J. Smith, SITE Program

BEST COPY AVAILABLE